REMARKS

A Petition for One Month Extension of Time is concurrently filed herewith.

Reconsideration and allowance in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

Claims 3 and 4 have been amended. Claims 3, 4 and 8 are pending in this application.

Claims 3, 4 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Burke in view of Harding and Hoyle. Applicant traverses the rejection for the following reasons.

First, the claimed invention recites, in part, the feature that the web browser detects a movement of a cursor displayed in a display screen on a monitor of the client PC, and, when the cursor is located in a text box of the web browser, the web browser displays an advertisement in an area of the display screen where at least one of a menu bar, tool bar, a location bar, and/or browser logo of the web browser are to be displayed, instead of displaying the at least one of the menu bar, tool bar, location bar, and/or browser logo, as recited in amended claim 1. Applicant submits that none of the references discloses or teaches this limitation.

For this limitation, the Examiner is relying on Harding quoting "Harding teaches a GUI for a software application whereby when a user's mouse hovers over a particular area of the interface, clickable, cascading menus appear in order to launch other applications or applets (i.e. program functionality) from them [3:10-21, 55-67, 4:1-5]." Applicant submits that while the Examiner's finding is true, these passages are patentably distinguished from the feature of the claimed invention.

According to the claimed invention, the web browser displays and advertisement in an area of the display screen where the menu bar, etc., would be displayed, instead of displaying the menu bar, etc. In other words, the area where menu bar, etc., would be

displayed, would display the advertisement when the cursor is <u>moved away</u> from the menu bar, etc., area. To the contrary, the assistance to progress to the next level of disclosure, providing a cascading menu, which may be a menu of information types, would be caused when the mouse pointer is <u>moved into</u> the assistance window. Applicant submits that this scheme of Harding is exactly the opposite way from the feature of the claimed invention and in fact teaches away from the claimed invention.

Second, the prior art cited by the Examiner fails to disclose or suggest the feature that the advertisement is disappeared, but the at least one of the menu bar, tool bar, location bar, and/or browser logo are displayed when the cursor is located in the area of the display screen where the at least one of the menu bar, tool bar, location bar, and/or browser logo are to be displayed. In other words, when the cursor is moved back to the menu bar, etc., area, then the advertisement is disappeared and instead the menu bar, etc., will be displayed. Again, Harding is moot in this regard. While Harding discloses that a menu of information type will be displayed when the mouse pointer is located over the assistance window, Harding is moot disclosing the feature of this disappearance of the advertisement when the cursor is moved into the menu bar, etc., area.

Third, according to the claimed invention, the advertisement is displayed in an area of the display screen where at least one of a menu bar, tool bar, a location bar, and/or browser logo of the web browser are to be displayed instead of displaying the at least one of the menu bar, etc., in order to reduce the amount of information displayed on the screen of computer monitor and to avoid bad images to the clients (see page 2, second full paragraph). None of the references cited by the Examiner discloses or teaches this feature. For this limitation, Applicant applies Hoyle. However, as shown in Fig. 5, Hoyle uses a built in advertising display area located between the menu bars. Please note that the advertisement will <u>replace</u> the menu bars, etc., according to the claimed invention.

Fourth, according to the claimed invention, the server stores a plurality of advertisement and transmits at least one advertisement to the client PC, for displaying as the advertisement, at a request of a client PC or at predetermined time intervals. Again, the prior art cited by the Examiner neither disclose nor suggest this feature. While Hoyle discloses that the client software application downloads new banners, Hoyle at least fails to disclose or suggest the feature that the server transmits advertisement to the client PC at predetermined time intervals.

For all of the reasons discussed above, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 3, 4 and 8 are not made obvious over Burke in view of Harding and Hoyle under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

The prior art made of the record and not relied upon is noted.

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that claims 3, 4 and 8 are now in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. If any issues remain to be resolved, the Examiner is cordially invited to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

MAYER BROWN ROWE & MAW LLP

By: _____
Yoon S. Ham
Registration No. 45,307
Direct No. (202) 263-3280

YSH/jr
Intellectual Property Group
1909 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006-1101
(202) 263-3000 Telephone
(202) 263-3300 Facsimile

Date: February 3, 2006